

REMARKS

This Application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Advisory Action mailed April 12, 2006. In order to advance prosecution of this Application, Claims 1, 4, 7, 8, 10, 11-13, 17, and 19 have been amended. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and favorable action in this Application.

The Examiner issued a Final Action on January 19, 2006. Applicant submitted a Response to Examiner's Final Action on March 20, 2006. The Examiner issued an Advisory Action on April 12, 2006 stating that the Response to Examiner's Final Action would not be entered because it did not place the application in better form for appeal. Applicant respectfully requests continued examination of this Application so that the Response to Examiner's Final Action can be entered and considered by the Examiner pursuant to this Request for Continued Examination. For the convenience of the Examiner, the amendments made to the claims in the Response to Examiner's Final Action and the accompanying comments are repeated herein.

Claims 1, 2, 4, 7-15, and 17-19 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Garnett, et al. in view of Stiffler, et al. Independent Claims 1, 11, and 17 have been amended to include all of the features of dependent Claims 5 and 6. Independent Claims 1, 11, and 17 recite in general the ability to connect a second processing device to a bus prior to disconnecting from the bus a first processing device having access thereto while other processing devices are not connected to the bus. By contrast, the Garnett, et al. patent does not provide any disclosure of an ability to have two processing devices briefly connected to a bus at the same time. The Examiner readily admits that the Garnett, et

al. patent fails to disclose an ability to connect one of a plurality of processing devices to a bus prior to disconnecting another one of the plurality of processing devices from the bus. To offset the deficiencies of the Garnett, et al. patent, the Examiner cites the Stiffler, et al. patent for its pre-grant bus access request technique. However, all of the processing elements in the Stiffler, et al. patent are connected to the bus and a bus access request is pre-granted for a particular processing element to inform the particular processing element that it is next to have access to the bus once it becomes available after being used by the previously granted processing element. There is no connecting and disconnecting of processing elements to and from the bus within the Stiffler, et al. patent. The structure that would result from placing the pre-grant bus access request technique of the Stiffler, et al. patent, where all processing elements are connected to the bus and a particular processing element is merely informed that it is next in line to have access to a bus, into the bridge system of the Garnett, et al. patent, where one processing device is not connected to the bus prior to disconnecting another processing device from the bus, would still lack an ability to connect a second processing device to a bus prior to disconnecting from the bus a first processing device having access thereto while other processing devices remain disconnected from the bus as required by the claimed invention. Moreover, the Garnett, et al. and Stiffler, et al. patents are incompatible with each other as the Garnett, et al. patent does not allow more than one processing device to be connected to the bus while the Stiffler, et al. patent discloses having all processing elements connected to the bus. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 1, 2, 4,

7-15, and 17-19 are not anticipated by the Garnett, et al. patent.

Claims 3, 16, and 20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Garnett, et al. in view of Stiffler, et al. and further in view of PCI Local Bus Specification. Independent Claims 1, 11, and 17 from which Claims 3, 16, and 20 depend have been shown above to be patentably distinct from the proposed Garnett, et al. - Stiffler, et al. combination. Moreover, the PCI Local Bus Specification does not include any additional material combinable with the either the Garnett, et al. or Stiffler, et al. patents that would be material to patentability of the claims. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 3, 16, and 20 are patentably distinct from the proposed Garnett, et al. - Stiffler, et al. - PCI Local Bus Specification.

This Response to Examiner's Final Action is necessary to address the Examiner's interpretation of the cited art in support of the rejections to the claims. This Response to Examiner's Final Action could not have been presented earlier as the Examiner has only now provided the current interpretation of the cited art to support the claim rejections.

Please charge Deposit Account No. 02-0384 of BAKER BOTTS L.L.P. an amount of \$790.00 to satisfy the request for continued examination fee of 37 C.F.R. §1.17(e).

Applicant respectfully requests a one month extension of time for submitting this Request for Continued Examination. Attached herewith is a Notification of Extension of Time in support thereof.

CONCLUSION


Applicant has now made an earnest attempt to place the Application in condition for allowance. For the foregoing reasons and for other reasons clearly apparent, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and full allowance of all pending claims.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any amount required or credit any overpayment associated with this Application to Deposit Account No. 02-0384 of BAKER BOTTS L.L.P.

Respectfully submitted,

BAKER BOTTS L.L.P.

Attorneys for Applicant

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Charles S. Fish', is written over the printed name.

Charles S. Fish

Reg. No. 35,870

May 19, 2006

CORRESPONDENCE ADDRESS:

2001 Ross Avenue, Suite 600

Dallas, TX 75201-2980

(214) 953-6509

Customer Number: 32764